

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,379	12/18/2000	Janine L. Helms	10004480-1	8819
7590 04/23/2004			EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			QURESHI, SHABANA	
Intellectual Property Adminstration				
P.O. Box 272400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			2155	2
			DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

'		7	1
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
	09/745,379	HELMS, JANINE L.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shabana Qureshi	2155	_
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise 	action is non-final.		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 18 December 2000 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex 	re: a) \square accepted or b) \square object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Serion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		

Art Unit: 2155

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities: Dependency is improper.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The matter of claim 5, "...identifying an action for the peripheral devices to take upon occurrence of a condition" is vague and indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon Leong et al (US Patent No. 5,996,010).

As per claim 11, Leong et al teach a method comprising:

communicating, by a peripheral device in a intranet, a request to a predetermined web site hosted by a server that is not in the intranet (column 6, lines 23-34); and

Art Unit: 2155

- in response to the communicating, receiving a predetermined device configuration from the predetermined web site (column 3, lines 52-57);

Leong et al does not specify that in response to receiving the configuration commands sent by the remote server, the predetermined device configures itself. However, in column 13, lines 42-57, Leong et al teach the presentation of management commands in an HTML document to the peripheral device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the peripheral device implements the management commands received from the remote server in order to allow itself to be managed remotely (column 1, lines 54-58).

As per claim 12, Leong et al teach a method as recited in claim 11. Leong et al further teach that the predetermined web site is a printer management service (column 6, lines 13-22, network management agent), the response is a printer configuration (column 5, lines 46-61, network management information), and the peripheral device is a printer (column 6, lines 19-21, end device may be a peripheral).

As per claim 13, Leong et al teach a method as recited in claim 11, wherein the peripheral device comprises an embedded web server for generating Web pages (column 2, lines 54-65), the communicating further comprising encoding the configuration request as a Web page (column 2, lines 54-65).

As per claim 14, Leong et al teach a method as recited in claim 11. Leong et al teach that the device configuration is encoded as a web page and wrapped in HTTP (column 9, lines 16-17) such that a peripheral device that includes an embedded web server can parse and execute the encoded device configuration to configure one or more settings or resources that correspond

Art Unit: 2155

to the peripheral device (column 9, lines 10-43). Leong et al does not specify that the web pages contain XML. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the information on the web page in XML because it is commonly known that XML is scalable to many applications.

As per claim 15, Leong et al teach a method as recited in claim 11, further comprising:

- in response to a condition, forwarding, a notification message to the predetermined web site (column 3, lines 36-52);
- -receiving a notification response based on the notification message from the predetermined web site, the response comprising a set of control functions (column 3, lines 36-52); and
- -in response to receiving the notification response, implementing one or more of the set of control functions (column 3, lines 36-52).

As per claim 16, Leong et al teach a computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, performs the method of claim 11 (column 4, lines 19-23).

Claims 1-4, 6, 10, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon Leong et al (US Patent No. 5,996,010) in view of Charles Keyes et al (US Patent No. 6,516,427).

As per claim 1, Leong et al teach a method providing peripheral device management the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2155

- pre-configuring a peripheral device to communicate a request to a predetermined web site (column 3, lines 62-65) upon booting up in the intranet (column 4, lines 19-23; column 3, lines 35-50);
- receiving the request at the predetermined web site from the preconfigured peripheral device (column 3, lines 52-57)

in response to receiving the request:

- generating a response based on the request, the response comprising one or more control commands used by the preconfigured peripheral device to perform one or more functions (column 3, lines 48-61); and
- communicating the response to the preconfigured peripheral device (column 6, lines 31-32).

Leong does not teach that the predetermined web site is on a separate server from the peripheral device. However, Keyes et al teach request-response exchange between a peripheral and a web server on a separate network protected by a firewall (column 4, lines 29-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Leong et al to place the network management web site on a server separate from the peripheral device and protected by a firewallso that the peripheral device within a protected intranet may be serviced without personnel since "personnel are generally in short supply and are often not able to respond to such a problem (Keyes et al, column 1, lines 35-38)".

As per claim 2, Leong et al in view of Keyes et al teach a method as recited in claim 1.

Leong et al further teach that the predetermined web site is a printer management service

Art Unit: 2155

(column 6, lines 13-22, network management agent), the response is a printer configuration (column 5, lines 46-61, network management information), and the peripheral device is a printer (column 6, lines 19-21, end device may be a peripheral).

As per claim 3, Leong et al in view of Keyes et al teach a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the request is a configuration request, the method further comprising:

- determining a default device configuration corresponding to the peripheral device (column 5, lines 46-61, network management information is default device configuration); and
- wherein the response further comprises the default device configuration (column 3, lines 40-56; column 5, lines 46-61, network management information is default device configuration).

As per claim 4, Leong et al in view of Keyes et al teach a method as recited in claim 3. Leong et al further teach the determining further comprises presenting a user interface to a customer for the customer to select one or more configuration settings corresponding to the peripheral device (column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 5).

As per claim 6, Leong et al in view of Keyes et al teach a method as recited in claim 3. Leong et al teach that the device configuration is encoded as a web page and wrapped in HTTP (column 9, lines 16-17) such that a peripheral device that includes an embedded web server can parse and execute the encoded device configuration to configure one or more settings or resources that correspond to the peripheral device (column 9, lines 10-43). Leong does not specify that the web pages contain XML. However, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2155

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the information on the web page in XML because it is commonly known that XML is scalable to many applications.

As per claim 10, Leong et al in view of Keyes et al teach a computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, performs the method of claim 1 (column 4, lines 19-23).

As per claim 17, Leong et al teach a system comprising:

- -a web site being configured to determine a default device configuration corresponding to a peripheral device (column 3, lines 35-50; column 6, lines 29-31, management information is obtained according to the request), the peripheral device being preconfigured to communicate a request to the web site upon being booted up in an intranet, the web site not being hosted by a server that is part of the intranet (column 3, lines 62-65; column 4, lines 19-23, column 6, 23-31),
- -in response to receiving the request, the web site is configured to communicate the default device configuration to the peripheral device (column 3, lines 48-61), the default device configuration being communicated (column 6, lines 31-32), the default device configuration being used by the peripheral device to configure itself (column 13, lines 38-46).

Leong does not teach that the predetermined web site is on a separate server from the peripheral device protected by a firewall. However, Keyes et al teach request-response exchange between a peripheral and a web server on a separate network protected by a firewall (column 4, lines 29-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Leong et al to place the network management

Art Unit: 2155

web site on a server separate from the peripheral device so that the peripheral device may be serviced without personnel since "personnel are generally in short supply and are often not able to respond to such a problem (Keyes et al, column 1, lines 35-38)".

As per claim 18, Leong et al in view of Keyes et al teach the system as recited in claim 17, wherein the peripheral device comprises an embedded web server to communicate the request as a web page (column 2, lines 54-65) and to parse the communicated default device configuration (column 9, lines 10-43), the communicated default device configuration being communicated as a web page (column 2, lines 54-65).

Claims 5, 7, 9, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon Leong et al (US Patent No. 5,996,010) in view of Charles Keyes et al (US Patent No. 6,516,427), further in view of Michael Sorens et al (US Patent No. 6,6317,848).

As per claim 5, Leong et al in view of Keyes et al teach a method as recited in claim 3. Neither Leong et al nor Keyes et al clearly teach that the determining further comprises identifying an action for the peripheral devices to take upon occurrence of a condition. However, Sorens et al teach that peripheral devices have predetermined trigger events (column 1, lines 49-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the trigger events feature of Sorens et al into the combination of Leong et al and Keyes et al because doing so would allow the HTTP server of Leong et al to be notified of events and apply the appropriate network management function (Leong et al, column 1, lines 54-60).

Art Unit: 2155

As per claim 7, Leong et al in view of Keyes et al teach the method as recited in claim 1. Leong et al nor Keyes et al teach providing requests by sending emails. However, Sorens et al teach:

- providing an e-mail address, the request being a notification message that is communicated to the e-mail address (column 1, lines 49-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the e-mail notification feature of Soren et al into the combination of Leong et al and Keyes et al because doing so would allow the HTTP server of Leong et al to be notified of events and apply the appropriate network management function (Leong et al, column 1, lines 54-60).

As per claim 9, Leong et al in view of Keyes et al teach a method as recited in claim 1. Leong further teaches the method comprising:

- determining a response based on the request, the response specifying a set of control functions that address the request (column 3, lines 36-52); and
- forwarding the response to the peripheral device such that the peripheral device can implement the set of control functions (column 3, lines 36-52).

Leong et al nor Keyes et al teach providing requests by sending emails. However, Sorens et al teach:

- providing an e-mail address, the request being a notification message that is communicated to the e-mail address (column 1, lines 49-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the e-mail notification feature of Sorens et al into the combination of

Art Unit: 2155

Leong et al and Keyes et al because doing so would allow the HTTP server of Leong et al to be notified of events and apply the appropriate network management function (Leong et al, column 1, lines 54-60).

As per claim 19, Leong et al teach a system as recited in claim 18. Leong et al nor Keyes et al teach providing requests by sending emails. However, Sorens et al teach:

- providing an e-mail address, the request being a notification message that is communicated to the e-mail address (column 1, lines 49-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the e-mail notification feature of Sorens et al into the combination of Leong et al and Keyes et al because doing so would allow the HTTP server of Leong et al to be notified of events and apply the appropriate network management function (Leong et al, column 1, lines 54-60).

As per claim 20, Leong et al in view of Keyes et al, further in view of Sorens et al teach the system as recited in claim 19, Leong et al further teach that the response comprises one or more control codes corresponding to functions to be performed by the peripheral device upon receipt of the response (column 6, lines 31-32).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon Leong et al (US Patent No. 5,996,010) in view of Keyes et al, further in view of Michael Sorens et al (US Patent No. 6,6317,848), further in view of Masahito Ohtani (US Patent No. 6,108,099).

Leong et al in view of Keyes et al further in view of Sorens et al teach the method as recited in claim 7. Neither Leong et al nor Keyes et al nor Sorens et al teach that the response is

Application/Control Number: 09/745,379 Page 11

Art Unit: 2155

selected from a group of responses comprising of ordering a toner cartridge for the printer or dispatching a service representative to service the printer on-site. However, Ohtani teaches selection from a group of responses comprising of ordering a toner cartridge for the printer or employing a service representative to service the printer on-site (column 7, lines 30-47). It would have been obvious to combine the feature of ordering toner service into the teachings of Leong et al in combination with Keyes et al and Sorens at al because doing so would replenish the toner supply since it can't be replenished through configuration management commands or through email (column 1, 50-56).

Application/Control Number: 09/745,379 Page 12

Art Unit: 2155

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shabana Qureshi whose telephone number is (703) 308-6118. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shabana Qureshi Examiner Art Unit 2155

19 April 2004

HOSAIN ALAM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER